As the final result of the work of categorizing,[1] there were two large groups, and some story-tellers who either fell outside these groups or rose above them. When the two groups were before me, listed by name, I noticed that the final dividing line between them was identical with the dividing line between the rich and the poor among them. 538 565

It is necessary that I give the local conception of these two terms. The rich - they call them (pógár), that is, 'citizen' - are those who live on their own property, not having to depend on working for others. The lower limit of the material foundations for such a status is a farm of seventeen to twenty acres. This class is fairly uniform, because a farm of over forty-three acres is a great rarity, and even if there is one of eighty-five acres in every fifth village, its owner cannot constitute his own society. 565 829 [423]

The other category is that of the "poor man." To this belong the field-guards, the laborers, the small-holders who have an acre or two, etc. Of course, within these broad limits there are many subdivisions, but it does seem that the most important dividing line is between those who live on their own substance and those who depend on working for others for their living. This is shown by the conscious distinction implied in the use of "citizen" and "poor man."

I have noticed that the demeanor of persons of identical spiritual structure differs according to whether one belongs among the "citizens" and the other among the "poor men." 538 [154]

In both of these groups there exist extreme types. Among the poor, it is the professional story-teller, whom I shall name, without meaning to cast any reflection, the 'minstrel type.' Among the rich, it is the 'gentleman anecdote-teller.'

I found a swineherd story-teller to be the prototype of the minstrel group. He was the only one of my story-tellers who was not even twenty years old. He had heard many stories and anecdotes, and he had learned to tell them. He already had the technique of a story-teller. The following occurence is very characteristic of his demeanor.

I always used to ask the story-teller where he had learned the story he had just told. Concerning one of them, he said that he had thought it up himself. He said this about a fairly well-known story, and within barely a week I noted two variations of the same story in two nearby villages.

Nevertheless, there is something in the story that did originate with him. He had probably heard the story a long time before, and

[1] [See p. 7, ent. 116 --Analyst]

538 with whom they probably had the most trouble.

Very close to this type is another story-teller, the wealthier old citizen. He told folk tales and anecdotes, but he told them in the coolest manner. He was very careful not to let himself drop into the role of the minstrel. He communicated, rather than related, the stories. In his cool demeanor, he went almost to the limit beyond which the interest of the stories would have suffered.

The intermediate types tend to approach each other. Poor men with more relaxed feelings, soft-voiced charming old men and women, young men aware of their own worth constitute this group among the poor people. Friendly men, good-humored women and self-assured young men constitute it among the rich people. But they are distinguished from each other by that calm feeling of security which exists in the rich, but is lacking in the poor.

[156] [565] A very interesting new type[1] is the group of 'bohemians.' It is here that we can see most clearly the difference caused, despite identical personalities, by the social status. The bohemians among the poor take almost no account of the village morals [8] as they apply to them. Their demeanor in telling a story is not identical with that of the minstrels, but it is very close to it. Story-telling is a highly favored form of expression for their own free good-humor. They have no consideration for the possible desires of their audience.

The richer bohemians are noticeably restricted by the fact that they belong among the "citizens." They cannot overstep with impunity the bounds of the conduct of the "citizen." They exert their bohemian natures within certain petty bourgeois bounds. Their favored modes of expression are conversation and story-telling.

The following type is represented in both groups, but with different shadings. Using the name of a well-known character from Hungarian literature, I shall name them the 'János Hárv type.' They have good a memory, and they know old things. But they immediately turn the conversation toward themselves, and relate adventures concerning themselves that are of the János Háry type.

The poor man must tell much bigger things of himself before he becomes interesting. And in attempting this, he does not even notice that he becomes ridiculous if he oversteps the bounds of probability by too much. He wants to maintain his reputation by constantly repeating his adventures, never noticing that people are laughing at him behind his back.

1 [of story-teller. For more data - see cat. 538, pp. 7-12--Analyst]